

Claim Rejections

The Examiner reiterated the rejection of claims 1-4 and 8-10 [sic] under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and the rejection of claims 14-15 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The Examiner further states:

Applicant argues: (a) Grosser does not teach a card insulator that has a single planar portion" [sic] Examiner disagrees. Response to argument (a), Applicant recites "the card insulator comprising: a single planar portion" and may be having something more. Grosser clearly discloses a card insulator (100-figure 1) comprising: a single planar portion (101). The single planar portion (101) can be had something more such as a portion (105) which is perpendicular to portion (101).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The cited art of Grosser discusses a card insulator for a computer system having hot plugable adapter cards. Applicant represents such a card insulator as prior art in Applicant's background with reference to Figure 1. The Examiner contends that Grosser **anticipates** Applicant's recited card insulator comprising a single planar portion (see independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 19), since the use of the word 'comprising' allows for the card insulator to include something more than a single planar portion, which Grosser has in the form of portions 101 and 105. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully submits that the use of the term 'single' clearly indicates that that recited card insulator does not include more than one planar portion. In contrast, as described by Grosser in col. 3, lines 9-19, Grosser's card insulator includes "a first planar portion 101" and "a second planar portion 105 ... connected to first planar portion 101 and extends substantially perpendicular to first planar portion." Applicant respectfully submits that by Grosser's own teaching, a card insulator includes perpendicular first and second planar portions, and there is nothing to teach or suggest that the card insulator would have a single planar portion. Applicant further respectfully submits that the card insulator of Grosser would have to be taught or suggested as having something less to produce a card

insulator comprising a single planar portion. There is nothing to teach or suggest that Grosser's card insulator would or could comprise something less.

In fact, Applicant respectfully submits that the elimination of the second planar portion, as would be necessary to teach or suggest Applicant's recited card insulator, would teach away from Grosser. For example, in col. 4, lines 10-19, Grosser teaches:

The positioning of the second planar portion relative to the first planar portion should provide sufficient space between the motherboard and the second planar portion to allow for the maximum height of components on the motherboard and to provide sufficient clearance for components attached to the adjacent adapter card. With second planar portion 105 spaced apart from motherboard 202 air flow over the motherboard components (e.g., 204) is significantly improved over the prior art insulating techniques described above.

Thus, Grosser clearly teaches that the second planar portion of the card insulator is necessary to achieve a benefit over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Grosser wholly fails to teach, show, or suggest a card insulator comprising a single planar portion.

With regard to the cited art of Haughton, the Examiner states:

Haughton shows a retainer guide (180-figure 1A) having a retainer lid (144) hingedly coupled to the at least one slot (120) and rotated from open to closed positions (see figures 2-4). It would have been obvious ... to use a lid of a retainer as taught by Haughton to employ the system of Grosser in order to provide a lock or unlock a circuit board (or card insulator) when inserted or removed from the system.


Applicant respectfully submits that even the inclusion of a lid of a retainer as taught by Haughton in the system of Grosser would not overcome the deficiencies of Grosser in teaching or suggesting a card insulator having a single planar portion. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Grosser in view of Haughton does not teach, show, or suggest the present invention.

Therefore, for the above identified reasons, the present invention as recited in independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 19 is neither taught nor suggested by the cited art of Grosser taken singly or in combination with Haughton. Applicant further submits that claims 2-3, 9, 15, 17, and 18 are also allowable because they depend on one of the above allowable base claims. In

view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a).

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Sawyer Law Group LLP
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 30,801
(650) 493-4540